



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/662,543	09/15/2003	Huang Shin-Pin	8295-000003	2271

27572 7590 02/06/2008
HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. BOX 828
BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303

EXAMINER

GEBRIEL, SELAM T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2622

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

02/06/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/662,543

Applicant(s)

SHIN-PIN, HUANG

Examiner

SELAM T. GEBRIEL

Art Unit

2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 8 - 15 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form.
3. Claims 8 and 9 are objected to because of the following informalities: "Said radio signal" lacks antecedent basis. Claims 8 and 9 will be considered as dependent upon claim 7.
4. Claims 10 and 11 are objected to because of the following informalities: "Said video camera" lacks antecedent basis. Claims 10 and 11 will be considered as dependent upon claim 9.
5. Claims 12 – 15 are objected to because of the following informalities: "Said wireless transmission technology" lacks antecedent basis. Claims 12 and 15 will be considered as dependent upon claim 11.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 4 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 4 and 13 contain the trademark/trade name Bluetooth. Where a trademark or trade name is used in a claim as a limitation to identify or describe a particular material or product, the claim does not comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. See *Ex parte Simpson*, 218 USPQ 1020 (Bd. App. 1982). The claim scope is uncertain since the trademark or trade name cannot be used properly to identify any particular material or product. A trademark or trade name is used to identify a source of goods, and not the goods themselves. Thus, a trademark or trade name does not identify or describe the goods associated with the trademark or trade name. In the present case, the trademark/trade name is used to identify/describe wireless transmission technology and, accordingly, the identification/description is indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2622

8. Claims 1 – 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Strandwitz (US 6,522,352) in view of Nasserbakht (US 5,658,063).

9. Considering claim 1, Strandwitz discloses a projection device (Figure 2), comprising:

A video camera (Figure 2, Element 130) for providing a camera signal;

A wireless transmitter (Figure 2, Element 102) electrically connected to said video camera for receiving said camera signal and transmitting said camera signal by means of a wireless transmission technology (Col 2, Line 31 – 38, Part of the Transceiver 100);

A wireless receiver (Figure 2, Element 101) for receiving said camera signal and transforming said camera signal into a projection signal (Col 2, Line 31 – 38, Part of the Transceiver 100); and

Strandwitz discloses the system comprising a video monitor 140 but fail to teach the video monitor being a projector.

Nasserbakht discloses in figure 7 that it was know to connect a wireless receiver 89 to a video projection system (Col 5, Line 30 – 41).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Strandwitz with Nasserbakht video projection system for the purpose of eliminating the monitor for increased portability.

10. Considering claim 2, Strandwitz in view of Nasserbakht further discloses the device according to claim 1, wherein said camera signal includes an audio signal and a video signal (Strandwitz, Col 3, Line 30 – 38, Col 2, Line 5 – 19 and Col 2, Line 45 – 59, Figure 2).

11. Considering Claim 3 - 6, the limitations of claim 1 are taught above, Strandwitz and Nasserbakht disclose transmitting signal wirelessly but failed to clearly specify the wireless means for transmitting signals being a wireless local area network, Bluetooth, infrared or radio frequency. Official Notice is hereby taken that it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to use a wireless local area network, Bluetooth, infrared or radio frequency as way of transmitting camera signals, since using wireless local area network technology, Bluetooth, infrared or radio frequency is a well known wireless transmission method in field of signal transmission.

12. Considering Claim 7, Strandwitz discloses a projection device (Figure 2) comprising:

A wireless receiver (Figure 2, Element 101) for receiving a radio signal and transforming said radio signal into a projection signal (Col 2, Line 31 – 38, Part of the Transceiver 100); and

Strandwitz discloses the system comprising a video monitor 140 but fail to teach the video monitor being a projector.

Nasserbakht discloses in figure 7 that it was know to connect a wireless receiver 89 to a video projection system (Col 5, Line 30 – 41).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Strandwitz with Nasserbakht video projection system for the purpose of eliminating the monitor for increased portability.

13. Considering claim 8, Strandwitz in view of Nasserbakht further discloses the device according to claim 6, wherein said radio signal includes an audio signal and a video signal (Strandwitz, Col 2, Line 5 – 19 and Col 2, Line 45 – 59, Figure 2).

14. Considering claim 9, Strandwitz in view of Nasserbakht further discloses the device according to claim 6, wherein said radio signal is provided by a video camera (Strandwitz, Col 3, Line 30 – 38, Col 2, Line 5 – 19 and Col 2, Line 45 – 59, Figure 2).

15. Considering claim 10, Strandwitz in view of Nasserbakht further discloses the device according to claim 8, wherein said video camera further comprises a wireless transmitter (Strandwitz, Figure 4, wireless camera device, Element 100 is communicating with other devices wirelessly therefore it is inherent that it would have a wireless transmitter, Col 6, Line 48 – 59)

16. Considering claim 11, Strandwitz in view of Nasserbakht further discloses the device according to claim 8, wherein said video camera electrically connects thereto a

wireless transmitter for transmitting said radio signal through a wireless transmission technology (Strandwitz, Figure 4, wireless camera device, Element 100 is communicating with other devices wirelessly therefore it is inherent that it would have a wireless transmitter, Col 6, Line 48 – 59).

17. Considering claim 12 – 15, the limitations of claim 1 are taught above, Strandwitz and Nasserbakht disclose transmitting signal wirelessly but failed to clearly specify the wireless means for transmitting signals being a wireless local area network, Bluetooth, infrared or radio frequency. Official Notice is hereby taken that it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to use a wireless local area network, Bluetooth, infrared or radio frequency as way of transmitting camera signals, since using wireless local area network technology, Bluetooth, infrared or radio frequency is a well known wireless transmission method in field of signal transmission.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SELAM T. GEBRIEL whose telephone number is (571)270-1652. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7.30am-5.00pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vu NgocYen can be reached on 571-272-7320. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

Art Unit: 2622

273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

S.G.

Wednesday, January 30, 2008



NGOC-YEN VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER